



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/722,508	11/28/2000	Teresa F. Lunt	104135	5996

7590 05/03/2005

Oliff & Berridge, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, VA 22320

EXAMINER

ARANI, TAGHI T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/722,508

Applicant(s)

LUNT ET AL

Examiner

Taghi T. Arani

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/28/2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are pending for examination.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment filed 01-04-2005 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1- 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art of record to Stefik et al. (hereinafter "Stefik") and further in view of Perry (USP 6,823,075).

As per claim 1, Stefik teaches a document forgery protection printing method, comprising (abstract):

processing an image of a document [Fig.5, element 501, see also col. 11, lines 25-30, col. 12, lines 10-15];

determining forgery protection requirements for the document to be printed utilizing a print management system [Figure 17, and associated text, numeral element 1705 where print server collects watermark information (forgery protection requirements), col. 3, lines 22-55 (encoding print right associated with the work) , see also col. 5, lines 47-59, Fig.10 and

Art Unit: 2131

associated text (print right specifies that a purchaser of the document must pay fees and that document must only be printed on a trusted printer];

determining a protection level to be applied to the document based on the determined forgery protection requirements [5, numeral element 501, i.e. a print usage right which specifies watermark information , col. 8, lines 40-54, i.e. expressing the rights in a rights language and that different watermarking technologies is applied to the same digital work, see also col. 10, col. 19-52Fig];

selecting a printer from a plurality of printers that can print the document [Fig. 5, numeral element 508, see also col. 4, lines 61-64]; and

based on the determined protection level, printing at least one watermark on the document that corresponds to the determined protection level using the selected printer [col. 7, lines 21-44, fig. 3, printer system 301, Fig. 6, elements 612].

Stefik is silent in disclosing “utilizing a computerized policy stored on a computer device.

However, Perry teaches utilizing a print management system and a computerized policy stored on a computer device in determining forgery protection requirements [Perry , Fig. 3 and associated text, col. 10, lines 12 –67, i.e. an embedder application which embeds a digital watermark into an image and prints the watermarked image (e.g. document, card, label, tag, coupon, ticket pass, etc.) and a database system (a computerized policy) which manages electronic transaction associated with assigning identifiers and using them in the printed object].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Stefik with the computerized policy of Perry because the

Art Unit: 2131

combination would provide a counterfeiting system implemented as software applications for an open platform (e.g., software applications for Microsoft windows or Linux) or as special purpose systems (e.g. special purpose printer for printing boarding pass, tickets , etc), see col. 10, lines 43-61].

As per claims 2, Stefik teaches the method of claim 1, wherein determining the forgery protection requirements includes displaying information about forgery techniques and using the displayed information in determining the forgery protection requirements to be applied to the document [Figure 6 and associated text, elements 607-611, i.e. copy, transfer, play or print, protection requirements representing forgery techniques and a watermark (element 613) embedding the rights)].

As per claim 3, Stefik teaches the method of claim 2, wherein displaying information further includes displaying information about forgery techniques each protection level is able to at least one of detects and deter and information about costs of using each protection level [col. 3, lines 21-55].

As per claim 4, Stefik teaches the method of claim 1, wherein determining the forgery protection requirements includes collecting information about the document and using the collected information in determining forgery protection requirements [Fig. 6 and associated text, elements 601-603 represents information about the document which determines forgery protection requirements disclosed in elements 604-611, see also Fig. 8 and associated text].

As per claim 5, Stefik teaches the method of claim 1, wherein determining the protection level includes identifying at least one of a creator of the document, a person entering a command to print the document, and an image processor that processes the image of the document, and

Art Unit: 2131

using the at least one identification in determining forgery protection requirements [Fig. 6, elements 602 (work-ID), 603 (Owner) and 604 (Rights-Group) and 606 (Access representing security –level),see also col. 9, lines 14-19].

As per claim 6, Stefik teaches the method of claim 1, wherein determining the protection level includes reviewing contents of the document and using the contents of the document in determining forgery protection requirements [Fig. 8 and associated test, see also col. 12, lines 36-52].

As per claim 7, Stefik teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising querying the plurality of printers to determine the protection level each printer can apply to the document and using one of the printers with a specific combination of protection techniques [Fig. 12 and associate text, see also col. 12, line 63 through col. 13, line 41, i.e. security and capabilities of the printer are checked and that the printer security and capabilities are specified an a certificate containing identification for the printer].

As per claim 8, Stefik as modified teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising setting printing parameters on the selected printer to apply the determined protection level to the document based on the policy [col. 13, lines 20-41].

As per claim 9, Stefik as modified teach the method of claim 1, wherein determining the protection level includes at least one of assigning and selecting the protection level by at least one of a creator of the document and a person entering a command to print the document and the policy [col. 12, lines 9-36, i.e. author or publisher assigns rights to the work using Right Editor (a program with which the document owner specifies terms and conditions of using a digital work)].

Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 10, Stefik teaches a document forgery protection printing system, comprising [col. 16, line 14-19]:

at least one server [Figure 16, Spooler 1603] having a print management system [Figure 17 and associated text , element 1705] that determines a forgery protection requirements [Figure 10 and associated text, see col. 12, lines 16-36] and a forgery protection level for the document [Fig. 17, element 1705-1706, col. 17, line 14 through col. 18, line 5];

at least one image processor that processes an image of the document [Fig. 5 and associated text, element 501, see also col. 11, lines 25-30, col. 12, lines 10-15];

a plurality of printers, each printer able to print the document and able to apply at least one protection level to the document by printing at least one watermark on the document that corresponds to the determined protection level [Fig. 5, numeral element 508, col. 4, lines 61-64, see also col. 7, lines 21-44, fig. 3, printer system 301, Fig. 6, elements 612].

Stefik is silent in disclosing at least “one server” having “a policy”.

However, Perry teach utilizing a print management system and a computerized policy stored on a computer device in determining forgery protection requirements [Perry , Fig. 3 and associated text, col. 10, lines 12 –67, i.e. an embedder application which embeds a digital watermark into an image and prints the watermarked image (e.g. document, card, label, tag, coupon, ticket pass, etc.) and a database system (a computerized policy) which manages electronic transaction associated with assigning identifiers and using them in the printed object].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Stefik with the computerized policy of Perry because the combination would provide a counterfeiting system implemented as software applications for an

Art Unit: 2131

open platform (e.g., software applications for Microsoft windows or Linux) or as special purpose systems (e.g. special purpose printer for printing boarding pass, tickets , etc), see col. 10, lines 43-61].

As per claim 11, Stefik teaches the document forgery protection printing system of claim 10, further comprising a display device, at least one of the server and one of the at least one image processors driving the display device to display information about forgery techniques and using the displayed information in determining forgery protection requirements for the documents [Figure 6 and associated text, elements 607-611, i.e. copy, transfer, play or print, protection requirements representing forgery techniques and a watermark (element 613) embedding the rights)], see also col. 6, lines 18- 45, see also col. 7, lines 21-44].

As per claim 12, Stefik teaches the document forgery protection printing system of claim 11, wherein the displayed information includes information about forgery techniques each protection level is able to at least one of detect and deter and information about costs of using each protection level [col. 3, lines 21-39].

As per claim 13, Stefik as modified teach the document forgery protection printing system of claim 10, wherein the policy searches content of document and determines the protection level for the document based on information collected from at least one of a creator of the document and a person entering a command to print the document [Fig. 6 and associate text, elements 602 (work-ID), 603 (Owner) and 604 (Rights-Group) and 606 (Access representing security –level)], col. 9, lines 14-19, see also Fig. 8 and associated test, see also col. 12, lines 36-52].

As per claim 14, Stefik as modified teach the document forgery protection printing system of claim 10, wherein the policy searches content of the document determines the protection level based on at least one of a creator of the document, a person entering a command to print the document, and an image processor that processes the image of the document [Fig. 6 and associated text, elements 602 (work-ID), 603 (Owner) and 604 (Rights-Group) and 606 (Access representing security –level), col. 9, lines 14-19, see also Fig. 8 and associated text, see also col. 12, lines 36-52].

As per claim 15, Stefik as modified teach the document forgery protection printing system of claim 10, wherein the policy determines the protection level based on at least one of a keyword and key phrase search from contents of the document [Fig. 8 and associated text, see also col. 12, lines 36-52].

As per claim 16, Stefik as modified teach the document forgery protection printing system of claim 10, wherein the policy determines the protection level based at least in part on a forgery protection requirements [col. 9, line 65 through col. 10, line 18] and a protection level assigned to the document [col. 12, lines 9-51].

As per claim 17, Stefik as modified teach the document forgery protection printing system of claim 10, wherein the server sets printing parameters for the selected printer selected to apply the determined protection level to the document based on the policy [col. 13, lines 20-41].

Action is Final

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taghi T. Arani whose telephone number is (571) 272-3787. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2131

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Taghi T. Arani, Ph.D.

Examiner

Art Unit 2131

4/22/05



AMIR SHEMAKH

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100